

Committee on Performance-Based Compensation for Teachers

August 16, 2004

9:00am – 3:00pm

LBJ Building, Room 302

650 West State Street

Boise, ID

Minutes Approved as corrected 9-22-04

Present: Karen McGee, Teresa Molitor, Wendy Horman, Ann Rydalch, Jack Wenders, Colleen Thompson, Dr. Stan Olson, Reed DeMordaunt, Parra Byron, Allison McClintick

Reed did a quick recap of our last meeting and reminded the committee that they need to remember to focus on the end result. – our major (ultimate) goal is to increase student achievement. There is a lot of information out there that shows high quality teachers equals increased student achievement.

We need to also focus on outputs vs. inputs – that makes it hard to define what good quality is. Jack said we're talking about value-added - A "low performing school" (socio-economic situation) can actually be high performing. We need to look at a value-added model like Tennessee's.

Wendy presented some information from Education Trust –www.edtrust.org
It confirms that we are on the right track by our focus on the value-added method and figuring out what that means for Idaho. My other favorite publication of theirs is "Good Teaching Matters," a pioneering publication, which took solid academic research on teacher effectiveness and translated it for public consumption. The publication can be downloaded from Education Trust.

Reed said there are two components to salary - the base and the variable. Our standards are a critical part of the base. Jack said "we need to ask the question about the relationship of student performance and the standards.

Colleen gave the example of the TOBI project. One of the reasons the Albertson Foundation pulled the funding was that the TOBI sites didn't perform better than anywhere else in the state over the one year. Now since the funds have been pulled there is no way to get any longitudinal data to see if the project really did work

Reed again pointed out that our goal is to develop a pay-for-performance pilot in the near future. In doing so do we need to work with the Legislature and the salary-based apportionment schedule or do we invent this. Ann said that the Legislature has tied the hands of districts with the present legislation. Reed said - we need to begin with the end in mind and ask how we can tweak the present legislation to meet our goal.

Teresa pointed out that the index says nothing about student achievement.

Jack suggested we use the index as a lever. Say a teacher takes 15 credits of directed prof. dev. that resulted in a certain percent of student achievement times the percent of kids that show a certain percent of value –added for the year.

Ann said we need something that empowers the administrators.

Discussion about present funding

Tim Hill said the state reimburses the school districts. With the recent legislative change, no position is funded for less than \$27,500.

A handout from Jeff Shinn explains the salary-based apportionment calculation formula. Also attached is a worksheet from Tim showing the estimated dollar equivalents of a unit.

On the last Friday in Sept. staff is figured. (a snapshot in time)
By December 15th the instructional index is set.

Attendance drives support units drives salary-based apportionment

Salaries amounted to approximately \$900,000,000 in 2003.

Districts are under a use it or lose it situation. They need to hire the full time equivalents they have reported and pay the dollar amount they receive or they lose it.

There are State Board guidelines for class size – the use it or lose it encourages districts to hire at certain levels.

The use it or lose it no longer applies to administrative staff. There are waivers for schools if their size is such that they can't hire full time support. They can contract.

Jack and Ann said that the state is handicapping the districts by the “use it or lose it” regulation. Jack said that we should focus on the achievement portion as opposed to the numbers game. Stan said there has been nothing over that last 10 years that relates class size to achievement.

Stan also said it is important to create flexibility for the districts. Boise District's contractual relationships do allow for flexibility.

Tim said that the “use it or lose it” concept is not meant to be “shackles” Districts hire more than the full allowance. The state needs to look at all sources of income and look at total need.

With the ‘use it or lose it’, any funds left over are returned to the Public School Budget Stabilization Fund. Tim said that the Department works hard to come as close as possible in figuring budget for the year. The amount that is presented is as close as approximate as they can get. (Example – for budget starting July 1, 2004 the budget needed to be submitted by Sept of 2003). The Stabilization Fund covers any misses in calculations.

60% of the payments to the schools is made in advance, based on what happened last year.

Stan said that districts' budget planning is a junior version of the state's.

Jack asked about the possibility of a line item in place of the teacher incentive award.

Reed asked what if the instructional index was based on performance instead of steps and lanes.

Colleen asked what if we were to not change the present legislation but changed the requirement at the 6th year to achieve a certain number of directed professional development credits. Stan said a professional development track would help district predictions.

Reed asked Tim if it would be possible to do pay for performance in June or July directly following the year. Tim said that after July 1, payments can be made relatively soon. Stan said Tim can process data reasonably in a week. Reed said that would be phenomenal if we could do performance pay and recognize those teachers immediately. Stan said staff would appreciate some extra at the end of the year.

The question was raised – why do public charter schools get what they get compared to some public schools. Tim responded that the formula is designed to help smaller schools so they can get the staff they need – economy of scale. Also the formula is based on who is hired – experience in education, and who is being taught. It costs a lot more to teach a senior in high school (\$7,000) than it does a kindergartner (\$2,000).

Teresa said if we change the grid all these other factors might not need to be considered. Reed said the steps and lanes are there because of lawsuits so we may need to keep some kind of grid in place. Jack said we need to get the two people who bargain to agree – the district and the union.

Discussion of Reed's model

Wendy asked if we could get models from around the country. She also said that parent involvement is very important. We need to engage parents in a meaningful way.

Reed presented the paper from Patty Toney. After some discussion Reed decided to have Patty share her thoughts at the next meeting.

Colleen said that it takes “an act of Congress to get rid of someone out of the system. Why can't it be that if there was a specific professional development system and if a teacher does not move from tier 1 to tier 2 in a specific time then that teacher needs to find something else to do. Many on the committee voiced some agreement. Reed said we need to attack that piece – perhaps with the base salary part.

Measure for achievement

The question was asked – What do we want to measure for achievement? –

Growth (value-added)

ISAT (reading, language arts, math and soon science)

What about grades 2 and 10 and 11?

What other growth measurements are there?

Jack suggested that the districts come up with a standardized way to make the measurements. Stan said the Committee could set some parameters to allow the districts to set their own measurements, which could then be juried.

Teresa asked about the specialists. Stan said that we should see how they interface with developed programs – maybe like Denver – as to the core area folk vs. the specialists. Reed said we need to better educate ourselves on what assessment measurement tools are out there.

We need to build in flexibility for the districts. Focus on the measures and let the districts define the tests.

Colleen observed that right now teachers get as much to get up each morning as they get if they pay to earn more credits.

When asked about measurement tools for areas other than those covered by the ISAT the end of course assessment (EOC) was brought up. It was suggested that we bring Don Coberly from the Boise Dist. and Carissa Miller from the Board in to discuss this further.

Karen said that Steve Hartgen, publisher of the *Twin Falls Times News*, has a model on employee evaluation he thought we should see.

Reed mentioned, going back to the thought that those teachers who apply for grants should be rewarded, that the grant would need to focus on achievement.

Regarding the principal evaluation piece –

Reed said he will bring in an evaluation model

We also need to get a principal to the table.

The Idaho Business Coalition for Excellence in Education will be at the next meeting to discuss and present their thoughts on teacher assessment and evaluation. They are working on a principal training program.

Key factors for principals to look at: What are the factors? They will probably need to be visionary and develop what they think they need to see in their building.

We also need to go up the ladder from principals to superintendents

Jack pointed out that the evaluations need to be made where the information is. He said there is a study that says principals are better evaluators than people think.

An average school staff is 21 FTE

Base salary piece

The base salary should take into account factors of performance. What are the factors that affect performance?

Wendy said there are 10 success factors, 10 domains (research-based) and are indicators of what they would look like. Reed asked how we could put these into the base piece. How do we link knowledge and skills to performance?

Demonstrates growth. Start with a base. Evaluation good then moves up evaluation bad then a directed professional development plan to be able to move up a tier within three years – or move to another occupation.

Presentation from the IEA

IEA – Jim Shackelford (IEA), Rob Nicholson (IEA), Kathy Lednecker (Pocatello School District), Nancy Larson (Coeur d’Alene School District), Steve Norton (Moscow School District)

Jim Shackelford opened the conversation -the IEA is not opposed to alternative compensation. They look forward to working with this committee. They would like to have had representation from IEA and IASA on the committee.

IEA feels the premise of performance-based compensation has been adopted without debate. Are we saying that more money will make teachers work better, harder and smarter? Teachers feel they are already giving and doing their best. Jim expressed 3 integral parts to this plan:

1. Current salary schedule should be continued, but continue to be improved. IEA would like to find a successful, mutual goal.
2. Reward and recognition should be given to teams/buildings, rather than individuals. Everybody plays a role.
3. Performance goals should be created by all stakeholders in the building: administration, staff, parents, community, business.

Reed observed that we’re not working on a different premise. It is not the goal of the committee to make performance-based-compensation for teachers an incentive to do better. The committee wishes to reward teachers for their performance and, in turn, encourage them to continue teaching. The current system does not reward working harder/smarter. There are different qualities of teachers.

Jim said that it is an admirable goal to recognize success, but it should be done in larger method than the individual teacher (i.e. team, building). Nancy said she works with a team of over 50. It is the combined role of the team that affects student achievement.

Steve said good teachers require putting other person's needs first, rather than only the desire to make money. Working conditions in the field of expertise should be the draw. Most districts' teachers work as a team, and shouldn't be encouraged to compete with fellow department staff.

Jim commented that the original reason the single salary schedule was developed was that men were being paid more than women. The schedule assures fairness in placement and movement on the schedule.

Colleen said merit pay allows payment for doing a great job and encourages teachers to seek what others are doing and use the models for their own improvement. Steve said that merit pay offers limited options. It can't reward everybody, just a few.

Karen said we are appreciative and will seek input from classroom teachers. Colleen said education is a team sport; collaboration is critical. Reed agreed, "We want to acknowledge excellence and encourage collaboration".

Jim said that current salary schedule says that experience and professional development are important.

Reed said that there is a lot to learn from districts who are doing things right.

Teresa commented that we hear all the time that teachers aren't paid enough. This committee is looking at paying teachers for the good jobs they are doing. Jim said that teachers should be paid fair and appropriately.

Steve said that the reason people go into teaching is not for the money, but to "see the light go on." Teresa countered that it is the nature of human beings to want to be paid more for what they are doing. Colleen said she is motivated by the incentive of getting more money for her accomplishments. Nancy said she went into teaching to make a difference to kids.

Colleen expressed the concern about the word "compete." She said she uses other teachers as her mentors.

Kathy said teaching is about what you've done with the students. It is broader than just the test scores.

In response to Teresa's question about what was the drawing force 20 years ago when IEA started looking at the salary schedule and teacher compensation, Jim responded that

the concern was pay equity and fairness, and new legislative programs (career ladder/school improvement).

Teresa asked if the IEA would work with pilot programs. Jim responded that the IEA would be there to support their members. They would support the pilot program approach.

Stan commented, “ If you give people what they want, they are willing to pay for it. He sees a tremendous dedication of staff, and results. It is necessary that we work together raising concerns and issues.” He feels many state initiatives are moving quickly and positively. “ They are doable, and it is essential that all are at the table. There are ways this can work and identify the process over time. We will never be able to pay enough, but should commit to the premise of - when we have the opportunity we should make it happen.”

Return to discussion on the base salary piece

When we look at successful teachers there are certain factors that stand out. What are the factors that make a good teacher?

Factors:

1. Field
2. Professional goals
3. Training – content area specialization
4. Collaboration for student achievement
5. Cognitive/verbal ability
6. Discipline training
7. Experience/effectiveness -- demonstrate adequate yearly progress

How can we do better than the current steps and lanes?

Professional development- Reed suggested we talk about how we can improve this. Perhaps we go back to some of the work that was done by MOST

Homework

Reed asked that the committee members look at the base salary piece so we can get something on paper.

The next meeting is set for September 22, 2004